

UNITED STATES

Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 32

DECEMBER 17, 1975 TO DECEMBER 19, 1975

(PAGES 41103 TO 42450)

signs that our market share in East Europe will be accelerating over the next few years.

The message is there and you can see it in neon lights ten feet high. Where we have sustained a total industrywide marketing program of trade missions, catalogue shows, trade shows, reverse trade missions, or other marketing activities, we have been able to reverse the trend.

To me it is clear—we can only regain our rightful share of the world markets through consistent and aggressive international marketing. Every company in this industry must take a more positive view of international trade. We must upgrade the importance of international trade in our future planning.

As companies and as an industry, we must devote more of our resources to the development and maintenance of international markets everywhere in the world. Because if we don't, ten years from now we could be in one heck of a mess.

Throughout the world, the business is there and it is growing every day. All we have to do is go get it. And I want you to know that NMTBA stands ready to help you regain your rightful share of other markets just as we have in the magnificent seven.

We will develop seminars and workshops to train your people on international financing, export licensing, contract negotiating, or any other subject that will benefit your company. We will conduct market research to locate new and promising markets for industry development. We will organize trade missions to help you gain a foothold in these new markets. We will sponsor foreign exhibitions so that you will have more opportunities to display your products overseas. We will organize reverse trade missions to bring foreign buyers to your plants. And we will bring large groups of foreign visitors to the International Machine Tool Show.

We will gladly do all of these things and more. But to make these programs work, we have got to have your support and we have got to have your participation.

I would like to challenge each and every one of you between now and the January Regional Meetings—tell your elected Directors or tell me what you think NMTBA should do to help you recapture your rightful share of the world market.

We think we know what to do but if our industry can generate a grass-roots movement aimed at once again leading the world's machine tool industry, if we can get that kind of a membership mandate, there will be no stopping us! So give your Association the colors and we will take the point in the new market invasion.

The battle is already in progress and right now the industry is losing its position in the world market. Adamant, Aggressive Action is required because the outlook will get you if you don't look out.

DEVELOPING A FORESTRY PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to share with this body letters which I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, to Mr. John Beale, president of the Society of American Foresters, and to Mr. William Towell, executive vice president of the American Forestry Association.

In January, we will be receiving materials developed by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture on the program and assessment for our forest and rangelands, as called for in the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. This was legislation which I introduced to bring some sensible long-range planning and man-

agement to our forest and rangeland resources.

In my letter to Secretary Butz, I emphasized the important role which our private forest lands must play in meeting our future needs for timber and other renewable resources. Most of our discussions regarding forest lands, unfortunately, usually involve only our national forests.

In my letters to Messrs. Beale and Towell I urged that their organizations provide suggestions on principles for the application of environmentally sound forest management and any specific legislative language which might be needed to translate these principles into practice.

In light of the recent Monongahela decision, the issue of forest management has become a very critical one in terms of the management of these resources and our future timber supplies. At the time the program and assessment are reviewed, this concern will also be very much in the forefront of our discussions. The administration has indicated that it will be prepared to provide its own recommendations.

This is an issue of great urgency for our economy and our renewable resources. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1975.

Mr. JOHN A. BEALE,
President, Society of American Forester,
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR JOHN: When I addressed your national meeting earlier this year, I suggested that Congress would benefit from the advice of your organization on modernization of forest management legislative authority. As you are aware, the Administration has now decided that it will not appeal the Monongahela case to the Supreme Court, and it will come forward, at long last, with proposed legislation.

It would be most useful to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I am sure to the entire Congress, to have the views of your organization on principles for the application of environmentally sound forest management and any specific legislative language that you would suggest to translate these principles into practice.

I shall look forward to hearing from you and your organization and to having you advise and counsel on means to assure effective resource management.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1975.

Mr. WILLIAM TOWELL,
Executive Vice President, American Forestry
Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: When I addressed your national meeting earlier this year, I suggested that Congress would benefit from the advice of your organization on modernization of forest management legislative authority. As you are aware, the Administration has now decided that it will not appeal the Monongahela case to the Supreme Court, and it will come forward, at long last, with proposed legislation.

It would be most useful to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I am sure

to the entire Congress, to have the views of your organization on principles for the application of environmentally sound forest management and any specific legislative language that you would suggest to translate these principles into practice.

I shall look forward to hearing from you and your organization and to having you advise and counsel on means to assure effective resource management.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1975.
Hon. EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In early January you will be submitting to Congress the first Assessment and Program required under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. The reports I have received indicate that the Forest Service has been making a most constructive effort to produce an effective report.

The purpose of this letter is to indicate to you several areas of interest that I have and which will need to be addressed when the report is considered.

The time frame for this first Assessment and Program was short, and it was urgent to get underway without delay. Thus I will be most interested in the observations and recommendations offered for strengthening the data base in order to have an improved Assessment and Program for the first full decadal period commencing in 1980.

There are 500 million acres of commercial forest land. Of this total only 107 million are publicly owned while 393 million acres are privately owned. Of the public acreage the National Forests contain 92 million acres. However, most of the dialogue over forestry seems to center on the forest land within the National Forests rather than the almost 80% which is privately owned.

It seems to me that, over the long pull, we are going to have to look to our private lands and to private initiative to supply a large portion of the wood, water, wildlife and other related forest benefits that the Nation will need from its forested lands. I would thus expect that, in the presentation of the Program and in the discussion of the situation, you and the Forest Service will focus on the opportunities, role and needs with regard to the private forest lands. Of special interest is the catalytic role that the public sector can provide in relation to the private sector.

In light of the Administration's conclusion that it will not appeal the Monongahela case to the Supreme Court, we will want your specific advice on the principles that ought to apply to assure environmentally sound forest management and the specific legislative language that you would suggest to translate these principles into practice.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

RIGHT TO READ AND READING IS FUNDAMENTAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education (Mr. PELL) for acting so expeditiously on H.R. 8304. This legislation, which the Senate adopted last evening, assures that State right to read programs currently receiving Federal funding, including a very effective program in my own State of Minnesota, will not lose Federal support this coming February. It also provides much needed Federal support for the

creative and effective reading motivation program known as Reading Is Fundamental.

Mr. President, I am particularly proud of the Minnesota right to read program which was initiated in 1972 and is now serving 70 percent of our State's 436 school districts. Since Minnesota began this program, more than 3,000 tutors have been trained and are working with nonreaders in all parts of our State. An independent evaluation of 22 Minnesota school districts has shown that students in right to read districts achieved two and one half times more than students in nonparticipating districts.

Recently, Ed Cain, the outstanding director of Federal/State programs with the Minnesota Department of Education, testified on this legislation before the House Education and Labor Committee. His statement provides an excellent description of the progress which has been achieved under State right to read programs, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this legislation also authorizes long overdue Federal support for Reading Is Fundamental. This successful program, known as RIF, has had an unparalleled record of accomplishment. Without any Federal support, RIF has grown from a single pilot project in Washington, D.C. in 1966 to 344 programs in 46 States serving 2 million children and their families. And these children are making dramatic progress in reading.

Mr. President, this record of achievement is due in large measure to RIF's unique approach of permitting children to choose from a wide variety of inexpensive paperback books, and by letting them keep these books as their own. It is also due to the outstanding leadership that Mrs. McNamara provided, and the generous support of foundation, corporation and literally thousands of individual volunteers.

I am delighted, in short, that this measure before us will assure continued support for the very promising State right to read program, and, at the same time, authorize initial support for the successful and imaginative reading is fundamental program. Let me close by again extending my appreciation to Senator PELL for his leadership on this measure.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY: EDWIN E. CAIN

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I would first like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this group.

Secondly, I would like to speak with you, this morning, about one of the most cost effective programs funded by the Federal Government. The State Right to Read Program, which has had the most far-reaching impact on the National reading problem, is about to be terminated if something cannot be done immediately.

The National Right to Read Program, funded since 1972 under the Cooperative Research Act, was rescinded by the Education Amendments of 1974, Public Law 93-380. Although I am sure this was not the intent of Congress, enactment of Title VII of P. L.

93-380 resulted in the termination of the State program component of The Right to Read Program as interpreted by the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Without an amendment to this legislation, the activities carried on by 49 states and two outlying areas will end on February 28th, 1976.

In 1974, when only thirty-one states were involved in this national effort, the state agency program was able to establish Right to Read Programs in 1,287 school districts, and provided in-service training for more than 60,000 teachers. This program affects 3.7 million students both at the elementary and secondary level. This entire effort over a three year period was conducted at a cost to the Federal Government of only \$5.3 million dollars. By June, 1975, the number of school districts participating in the State Right to Read Programs have increased to more than 3,400. Each has made a commitment to reading excellence, established a plan to attain these goals, and has initiated activities to respond to program deficiencies. No other program in the history of Congress, and The Office of Education has positively affected this many teachers and students for such a small amount of money.

There is no need to review for you the reading problem in this Nation. I've heard testimony before this Subcommittee that has brought to your attention the facts that we have some 18½ million adult illiterates in this country; that one child in four leaves school with severe reading deficiencies; that of the 700,000 youngsters who drop out of school each year, 90 per cent are disabled readers; that one child in five drops out of school sometime between grade five and prior to high school graduation. I hardly need to stress the impact that this situation has on our society, the economy and the welfare of the citizens of this United States.

Since 1965, the Federal Government has taken an active role in addressing this problem. The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its amendments have directed billions of dollars towards educational needs, many of those dollars used to fund programs addressing the reading problem. Dropout prevention programs, bilingual education and many demonstration projects are also directly attuned to the reading needs of our students. In spite of these efforts, and additional efforts by the state and local education agencies, the problem is still with us.

The demonstration programs funded under ESEA Title III and other such programs have given many insight into strategy, process, instructional approaches, and administration of reading programs, but these projects have affected a very small percentage of the school districts throughout the Nation.

ESEA Title I has done much to improve reading and the other basic skills of elementary students throughout the Nation. The problem with Title I is that while it can have a significant impact on those children two or more grade levels behind in reading ability, it does nothing to correct the system that produces these failures. We need both levels of effort. One to correct the mistakes our system has produced, and the other to change the system, the process of education, to assure that we do not continue producing educational and reading failures. It is just this system-change process that the State Right to Read Program produced. The State Right to Read Program is not a grants program, but rather a strategy to assure that all data and information that we have attained over the past years are brought together within a single management approach that assures excellence in reading.

The State Right to Read Program consists of 6 major parts, each of which are vital to systemic change.

1. The establishment of a State "Criteria of

Excellence" to serve as a standard of what a reading program should be.

2. A commitment by the school board and school officer to the development of a quality reading program.

3. The amassing of public support to assist in the resolution of the reading problem.

4. The preparation of reading leadership at the local school level.

5. The development of a state and local plan of action.

6. The implementation and evaluation of the plan of action.

The Right to Read State Agency Program was initiated by The Office of Education in 1972 with five states participating in demonstration projects with an initial \$10,000 Grant; these five states were to develop a process to impact the National reading problem. In Minnesota, this grant in conjunction with monies made available by the Minnesota Commissioner of Education and the commitment of the Governor of the State of Minnesota, gave impetus to the development of the Minnesota Right to Read strategy. It is important to know the premises on which this program was built. They are vital to its success.

1. All but one per cent of the population can be taught to read, and parents have the right to expect that each one of their children will learn how to read.

2. Drastic reform is necessary of at least that part of the educational system which has so consistently produced such a large number of functionally illiterate individuals.

3. The needed reform is not something that can be purchased, because no solution appears to be for sale. Mere money alone will thus not solve the problem. The solution will need to be built rather than bought.

4. The needed reform must be comprehensive in order that rural as well as urban, small as well as large, and non-public as well as public school districts are served equally. By comprehensive we also mean that the out-of-school illiterate is served as well as the in-school population.

5. The needed reform must be systematic and pervasive, rather than consisting of a stab here and a stab there. Random demonstration projects cannot solve the problem, for a system cannot be changed by merely working with a component—one teacher at a grade level, one grade level in a school, one school in a district, or one or two districts in a state. A system is changed by systematically getting to everyone and everything directly. Minnesota has 436 school districts and 464 non-public schools. All contribute to the problem. The solution will not be realized by only working with a few. The nation has about 18,000 school districts. The implication should be apparent.

6. The plan for reform must be replicable. Not only should the plan permit us to solve our immediate problems in the area of reading, but it will hopefully apply to the solution of other problems and in other locales.

7. The plan for reform must have clearly stated objectives, defined action steps, the necessary human and dollar resources, a broad base of support, and a limited amount of time in which to complete the task.

Proceeding from the established premises, the plan was developed. It appeared that in order to eradicate functional illiteracy in Minnesota's schools and out-of-school adult population, the state should attempt to do two things. The state should provide direct technical assistance to local education agencies (LEA's) for an extended period of time in order that quality reading programs may come to eventually be built. By technical assistance we mean the kind of help and knowledge that the typical LEA is unable to buy for itself. By local education agency, (LEA) we mean each and every public school district (436) and non-public school (464) which voluntarily seeks help. By extended period of time, we mean up to three and one-

half years. By quality reading programs, we mean programs which are able to meet the State of Minnesota Criteria of Excellence in Reading Programming. The technical assistance will help LEA's to achieve these criteria. This role of being a provider of technical assistance on a massive scale is new to the State Department of Education.

The state should also seek to ensure that each LEA come to eventually possess its own technical assistance person. We will call this person a reading director. This will be a leadership position. The reading director will be prepared to assume this role by completing a program of preparation, a curriculum, as conducted by State of Minnesota personnel.

On October 2, 1972, the Minnesota State Board of Education created a new position in Minnesota schools, that of reading director in Right to Read LEAs. A local education agency which designates a person as reading director may consider that person legally qualified to serve in that position upon his/her completion of the program of preparation.

The Minnesota Plan assumes that if an LEA is able to truly achieve the Criteria of Excellence, and if the LEA is served by a truly competent reading director, it will follow that functional illiteracy will be on its way to eradication. There is no single component more essential for educational reform in reading than the development of a "Criteria of Excellence." It provides the basis for assessing school district and community needs; it identifies the areas of training need for teachers and administrators; it serves as an evaluative tool in determining progress toward the stated goal and it alleviates the fear of change by showing what changes are to be made.

The Criteria of Excellence in Minnesota was established by the State Advisory Council for Reading. This Council included educators, parents, reading specialists, and a variety of others who represented concerns about reading and the educational system. Educators are too prone to avoid the identification of specific learning objectives. The Criteria of Excellence clearly stated what an effective, failure-proof, reading program in the public and private schools should be. This document served as a guide for school districts in the development of a comprehensive approach toward meeting the reading needs of children and adults.

The document not only deals with the instructional process, but also addresses all areas of the educational process which impinge upon learning. Certain criteria addressed the administration and organization of the reading program. There was a commitment to student learning and not just to staff teaching. The organization and management of the classroom was clearly addressed, as well as local community leadership and organization. The Criteria of Excellence recognized that a program must be comprehensive, not just dealing with one segment or a few grades of the school program, but addressing a pre-school through adult effort. It stressed the use of community resources and supported the development and initiation of intensive in-service training for teachers, support services for the administration, faculty, staff, volunteers, and parents.

Such a Criteria of Excellence has been developed in thirty-one Right to Read States along with a commitment to implement such a program on a schedule designed by each participating state agency.

In Minnesota we began with a 240 hour training program of local reading directors from 22 pilot districts selected regionally throughout the State. Each of these reading directors were responsible for the initiation of Right to Read Programs in their local districts, whether they be public school or private school districts. From that group of 22 local reading directors, 8 were selected to

serve as regional directors and to implement our "multiplier effect." The second phase of the program found each of the regional directors conducting classes of preparation for 20 or more new reading directors within their respective regions. By continuing this process over five phases in the past three years, we have now provided reading leadership at the local level in nearly three-fourths of our 436 school districts and 464 plus private school districts.

The larger school districts such as Minneapolis and St. Paul determined that the program would be more effective in the metropolitan schools if a reading director was prepared and assigned to each of the units within their school district. Minneapolis, for example, has employed seven reading directors, each of which has been assigned to an educational pyramid, i.e., a senior high school plus the "feeder" junior high schools and elementary schools within a specific geographical location.

In some of the small school districts and in the private schools, the position of the reading director may be combined with that of a master teacher or a principal. The important factor is that a specific, trained individual be delegated both the responsibility and the authority to carry out those functions that will reshape the system to meet the reading needs of children, youth and adults.

What impact has this strategy had on the reading program in Minnesota? This is the vital question.

Participation—Nearly three-fourths of Minnesota's 1,000,000 students attend public or private schools committed to Right to Read concepts. This feat has been accomplished in three years with no promise of money to local school districts, only the opportunity to improve the quality of education. They receive only technical assistance, reading leadership training, and an opportunity to share reading program materials and ideas with each other.

Volunteers—The greatest untapped resource this nation has in education are the citizens themselves. Parents, senior citizens, and students are currently providing millions of hours in volunteer services to the Minnesota Right to Read Effort.

In the adult literacy program alone, more than 3,000 volunteer tutors have completed 12 hours of training and are working in every section of the state, providing the opportunity for adult non-readers to overcome a handicap more severe than many physical and mental handicaps.

Finance—The Minnesota State Legislature has added over a million dollars to this effort. ESEA Title V funds also were used to increase the initial Federal grants. Seven other states now have passed or have pending legislation supporting their respective Right to Read programs.

Evaluation—Minnesota has initiated a twelve phase evaluation program which includes statewide assessment of reading skills. These studies have indicated a surging enthusiasm for the Right to Read effort by teachers, administrators, parents, and others surveyed. But most significant, a study conducted by an independent evaluation firm of 22 Right to Read and 22 non-Right to Read districts, found after seven months of program involvement that students in Right to Read districts achieved 2½ times more than students from non-participating districts.

Other Factors—The Right to Read concept encourages, supports, and enhances reading programs for all students. We all recognize the need for programs for the gifted and talented, but little has been done except in isolated demonstration programs to provide for the needs of these students. However, under the Right to Read "umbrella," the Great Books Program has increased from 14 school districts serving 1800 children in 1972, to 110 school districts serving 25,000 students

in 1975. Similar growth has been observed with RIF, Book Fairs, and other reading program activities.

Similar results are taking place in States across the nation, but it takes time to set in motion a program of the magnitude reached through the Right to Read State Agency Effort. The remaining 18 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia just received planning grants a few months ago. Twenty other states have been in operation a little over two years. To terminate legislative authority for funding at this time is simply unbelievable.

H.R. 8304 authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to continue the State Right to Read Program under Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974. Also, it permits the States to continue their work with secondary school students and adults as well. Without this amendment, program funding will expire in 31 states on February 28th, 1976, and in the remaining states, after one year of planning, in June, 1976.

The Honorable Wendell R. Anderson, Governor of the State of Minnesota, has been an educational leader in providing the impetus necessary to initiate a program of educational reform. In his speech to school administrators, launching the State's Right to Read Program, he made the following predictions.

"First, we must abolish functional illiteracy so that all our citizens, rich and poor alike, will have a better chance to learn from the accumulated wisdom of man. This is the goal of our Right to Read program, and to achieve it we must not only eliminate the existing reading and literacy deficiencies of today, but also reform our educational institutions so that these problems will not reoccur tomorrow."

I am sure the U.S. Congress had no intentions of terminating the State Right to Read program when this P.L. 93-380 was passed. This program has the strong endorsement of the Council of Chief State School Officers, as well as U.S. Commissioner Bell. The prompt passage of H.R. 8304 will assure that thousands of children, youth, and adults will have the opportunity to learn to read, and that the system that produces failures will be changed.

CRITERIA OF EXCELLENCE IN READING PROGRAMING

1. There is coordination of all of the administrative facets of the reading program.
2. There is continuous progress organization of the reading curriculum so as to preclude omissions.
3. There is a record keeping system for individual pupils.
4. There is a complete testing system which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures.
5. There is a commitment by staff to pupil learning.
6. There is refined accommodation of the varying moments of readiness, varying rates and modalities of learning, and special needs and problems of all children.
7. There is accommodation of the Instructional Reading Level of all children.
8. The materials that provide the basis for reading instruction must fairly reflect the racial, cultural, and sex differences found in our society.
9. There are curriculum adjustments in other subject areas for the children who are unable to cope with grade level reading matter.
10. There is ongoing in-service education for the total certificated teaching, supportive, and administrative staffs that is both intensive and extensive. Certificated staff will also include substitute teachers. Supportive staff is interpreted to include librarians, teachers of special subjects such as music and physical education, counselors, et cetera.
11. There is a program of preparation in reading for non-certificated staff who work in the classroom, such as teacher aides, par-

ent volunteers, et cetera, and for the auxiliary personnel associated with the school.

12. Opportunities are provided to junior and senior high school teachers in academic subject areas to develop the competencies which will allow them to accommodate the varying reading achievement levels of their students.

13. Each local education agency has a cadre of trained volunteer reading helpers.

14. There is an adult basic education component.

15. There is defined curricular provision within the LEA for individuals at both extremes of the aptitude continuum.

16. There is an articulated pre-school component that involves parents.

17. There exists readily available school and public library resources and services.

18. Provision has been made within the local education agency to produce instructional and practice materials for distribution to the teachers of reading. Materials that allow pupils to work independently and that articulate with the defined curriculum of the LEA are desirable.

19. Junior and senior high school teachers of reading have a demonstrated knowledge of developmental reading as it relates to their local education agency's curriculum.

20. The Board of Education of the local education agency has established an incentive program for teacher in-service education in reading.

21. Each local education agency defines their reading curriculum and makes the information available to the public.

22. Each local education agency has identified someone within the LEA who has the authority responsibility, and time for the development and maintenance of a quality reading program.

23. The local education agency annually has available the achievement levels of their pupils in reading by grade and/or age level.

24. Each local education agency has developed a reporting system for reading development that fully, accurately, and specifically documents a child's learning and provides such information to the parents.

MINNESOTA'S RIGHT TO READ EVALUATION DESIGN

I. Reading Achievement of Pupils in Grades 2, 4, and 6 in 11 Phase I Right to Read LEAs and 11 Non-Right to Read LEAs During the 1972-1973 School Year. Purpose: To assess pupil growth in reading attributable to Right to Read participation. Study report completed in September of 1973.

II. State of Minnesota Educational Assessment and Right to Read Mini-Assessment of the Reading Achievement of 9 Year Olds. Purpose: To assess pupil growth in reading attributable to Right to Read Participation. Pretest administered in January of 1974, Posttest to be administered in January of 1976.

III. A Study to Determine the Percent of Minnesota 16 Year Olds and Citizens Over 16 Years of Age Who Meet the Definition of Functional Literacy. Purpose: To assess the extent to which Minnesota has/has not realized the national Right to Read objectives. Instrumentation to be developed beginning in 1975. Instrument to be administered in the fall of 1979.

IV. A Report on the Number of Out-of-School illiterates Who Have Learned to Read as a Result of the MLCI and Right to Read Partnership. Purpose: To determine the number of literacy projects, individuals trained as tutors, individuals being tutored, and the number having learned to read. Annual Report filed beginning in May, 1974, and to continue through remainder of decade.

V. A Study of the Impact of the Minnesota Right to Read Program on School and Community: An Attitudinal Survey of Partic-

pants. Purpose: Determine the attitudes of participants about what is happening within the LEA as a result of participating in Right to Read. Survey of Phase I Participants done in January of 1974 and report completed in May of 1974. Survey of Phase II and III participants to be done in fall of 1975. Survey of Phase IV participants to be done in fall of 1976. Survey of Phase V participants to be done in fall of 1977.

VI. Processes and Results of Establishing Quality Reading Program: An Evaluation of the Minnesota Right to Read Program. Purpose: To assess the degree to which the 24 performance standards are being realized, and to evaluate the reasonableness of those standards. Survey of Phase I and II LEAs done in June of 1974 with final report completed in March of 1975. Survey of Phase I, II, and III LEAs to be done in September of 1975. Survey of Phase I, II, III, and IV LEAs to be done in September of 1976.

VII. An In-depth Analysis of a Right to Read School District. Purpose: To document the experience of a school district as it goes about the process of implementing the Right to Read strategies. Effects on institutions and individuals have been sought. The study was begun in August of 1975, and the report completed in January of 1976.

VIII. Special Education Questionnaire. Purpose: To gather information regarding the relationship of special education and the Right to Read effort. The survey was done in September of 1974 with the report completed in December of 1974.

IX. A Study to Determine Why LEAs Did Not Elect to Voluntarily Participate During the Primary Thrust of Right to Read (January, 1972-June, 1976). Purpose: To identify the reasons for failing to participate. The Study is to be undertaken in February of 1976.

X. A Study of Evaluation of the Right to Read Model for Reform. Purpose: To examine the strategies employed and assess the efficacy of those strategies combined with conclusions drawn as to why or why not each was successful. This study is to be begun in June of 1976.

XI. Letters of endorsement.

XII. Opportunities for individuals and agencies to piggyback on Right to Read in evaluative efforts.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, the Toxic Substances Control Act has now been pending before the Congress for nearly 5 years. While it has passed both the House and the Senate in each of the last two Congresses, irreconcilable differences on key provisions of the bill have prevented its enactment into law.

Most of the controversy has surrounded the premarket screening provisions of the legislation. While the Senate has steadfastly maintained that legislation should have a strong premarket screening function, whereby the Environmental Protection Agency is given notification prior to the manufacture of each new chemical, the House of Representatives has opted for a very limited form of premarket screening. In my view, and I share this with others on the Committee on Commerce, who have fought hard for toxic substances legislation, a strong premarket screening provision is an absolute necessity to protect the public from environmental pollutants at the time when the costs of control are the lowest. It is at this time, before expensive equipment has been purchased and built and before jobs are committed that con-

trol is most appropriate. But even more importantly, control at this stage avoids the pain, misery, and, in some cases, even death that all too frequently follows the production of chemicals in large quantities without sufficient knowledge as to their toxic properties.

The grim facts continue to mount. Vinyl chloride, BCME, DMNA, PCBs, and other chemicals in a number of instances recently have been found to cause disastrous health effects, and in several cases cancer. In fact, the cancer death rates are at an all-time high and, according to a National Cancer Institute study, are centered around the industrialized sectors of the country. NCI has estimated that up to 85 percent of the cancers are caused by substances placed in the environment by man.

It is high time that the trend be reversed and the Toxic Substances Control Act is a vital tool to reverse the trend.

Recently, an article appeared in the Sierra Club Bulletin which gives an excellent history of and rationale for the Toxic Substances Control Act.

In addition, an article appeared in the November 26 issue of Coastal Zone Management, a publication of Nautilus Press describing the results of an EPA conference on PCBs in November.

I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sierra Club Bulletin, November/December 1975]

TOX-IC! LEGISLATION TO CONTROL TOXIC SUBSTANCES

(By Nancy Buder and Linda Billings)

The following article is about poison—in the working place, the home, and the environment at large. It is about products that each of us uses every day, products that have already resulted in a significant incidence of disease and death. It is about Congress' repeated failure to pass legislation to assure that new substances are screened and tested for toxicity before they are introduced into the marketplace and from there into our homes. This article is not pleasant, but its subject is a matter of life and death. If, after reading this article, you agree that something must be done now to protect all of us from the vast array of toxic substances that contaminate our lives, take a few minutes to write your senators and representatives in Congress, urging them to support Senate Bill 776 and House Bill 7548, both of which would, for the first time, provide adequate controls on the introduction and use of hazardous chemicals.

Each human epoch revels in its singularity, proposing as unique virtues its responses to circumstance; as enlightenment, its own meager candle in the corridors of history. This is obvious enough in our own time in the pronouncements of politicians, the assurances of many scientists and engineers, and in the sloganeering of corporations and their ministers of marketing. Until the mid-sixties, when almost everything began to be called into question, most of us accepted, or at least put up with, such bromides. Progress was our most important product; modern chemistry was a miracle. In some ways, perhaps, it still is, yet increasingly we learn that yesterday's testube wonder has become today's Frankenstein monster. Radium, DDT, thalidomide, fluorocarbons, mercury, phosphates, asbestos, and various plastics, to name only the most notorious examples, are all former wonders now re-